



The ‘dark side’ of leadership personality and transformational leadership: An exploratory study

Hwee S. Khoo^a, Giles St. J. Burch^{b,*}

^a Department of Management and Organization, NUS Business School, National University of Singapore, Singapore

^b Department of Management and International Business, The University of Auckland Business School,
Private Bag 92019, Auckland, New Zealand

Received 24 May 2007; received in revised form 8 July 2007; accepted 19 July 2007

Available online 5 September 2007

Abstract

There is growing interest in dysfunctional dispositions in the workplace, in particular relating to leaders and managers within organizations. This paper reports an exploratory study investigating the relationship between the ‘dark side’ of leadership personality and transformational leadership. Data were collected from a sample of New Zealand business leaders and senior managers ($n = 80$) from scores on the Hogan Development Survey (HDS; Hogan & Hogan, 1997) and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Bass & Avolio, 1995). Regression analyses revealed the ‘Colorful’ (histrionic) dimension of the HDS to be a *positive* predictor of transformational leadership, while the ‘Cautious’ (avoidant) and ‘Bold’ (narcissistic) dimensions of the HDS were revealed as *negative* predictors of transformational leadership. This is one of the first reports to suggest a relationship between histrionic personality and transformational leadership, in a literature preoccupied with the relationship between leadership and narcissism.

© 2007 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Dark side; Dysfunctional dispositions; Leadership; Personality disorder; Narcissistic leaders; Transformational leadership

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +64 (0) 9 373 7599x86792; fax: +64 (0) 9 373 7477.

E-mail address: g.burch@auckland.ac.nz (G.St.J. Burch).

“The first characteristic of the leader we seek must be a deep, great, and genuine sincerity.”
(Field-Marshal the Viscount Montgomery of Alamein; Montgomery, 1961, p.17)

1. Introduction

There is a resurgence in the trait personality approach to understanding work-related behaviour and performance (for a current review, see Burch & Anderson, 2008). In particular, there is growing interest in the personality of leaders. For example, a recent meta-analysis into the trait-leadership relationship found leadership to be positively correlated with extraversion, openness, conscientiousness, and negatively related to neuroticism (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002). While there is this developing literature considering the ‘normal’ personality of leaders, another literature is growing alongside – that of the ‘dark side’ of leadership personality, that is, more negatively connotated traits (e.g., Hogan & Hogan, 2001). The study of the ‘dark side’ of personality has an important role in helping organizations identify those with the potential for ‘derailment’, deviant behaviours, and poor work performance (e.g., Furnham & Taylor, 2004; Hogan & Hogan, 2001; Moscoso & Salgado, 2004). Within this literature, a relationship between the ‘dark side’ and transformational leadership has often been alluded to (see Parry & Proctor-Thomson, 2002), yet there is limited empirical research investigating this relationship. Transformational leadership has been described by Bass and Avolio (2004) as encouraging other people to perform and develop beyond what is normally expected of them, and differs from transactional leadership, which refers to a leadership style focused on interpersonal transactions between managers and employees (Bass, 1985). For Bass (1985), transformational leadership enhances transactional leadership by transforming the follower’s mind-set and purpose, and bringing them to a higher level above immediate self-interests. Thereby, taking the process above the basic goal-achievement that transactional leadership accomplishes, and motivating followers to achieve beyond what they thought was possible.

Research investigating the relationship between the ‘Big Five’ and transformational leadership has found both extraversion and agreeableness to be positively correlated with transformational leadership (Judge & Bono, 2000), while Bono and Judge’s (2004) recent meta-analysis of the relationship between the Five Factor Model and transformational leadership found extraversion to be the most significant and consistent correlate with transformational leadership. Other research has increasingly ventured into exploring antecedent factors that may affect transformational leadership, such as emotional intelligence (e.g., Barbuto & Burbach, 2006; Barling, Slater, & Kelloway, 2000; Gardner & Stough, 2002) and the ethical issues of authentic and pseudo-transformational leadership, used by Bass to describe inauthentic leaders with immoral and distorted utilitarian principles (e.g., Bass, 1998; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Beyer, 1999; Price, 2003). However, one aspect of transformational leadership that has received little empirical attention is its relationship with the ‘dark side’ of personality.

Interest in the ‘dark side’ of personality at work has become increasingly popular over the last two decades (e.g., Burch, 2006; Furnham & Taylor, 2004; Goldman, 2006; Hogan & Hogan, 2001), with much of the literature suggesting narcissism (and more recently, psychopathy) being most implicated in leadership (e.g., Babiak & Hare, 2006; Conger, 1990; Conger & Kanungo,

1998; Lubit, 2002; Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006). Narcissistic personality is typically described in relation to charismatic leadership in the leadership literature (e.g., Sankowsky, 1995), and it is suggested that while narcissism may be positively related to rising into leadership positions, it does not predict effectiveness once in these roles (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006). However, it should be noted at this juncture that although charisma (the ability to inspire others to enthusiastically follow one, through one's charm) is a part of transformational leadership, transformational leadership goes *beyond* charisma (e.g., Bass, 1985). Indeed, research into transformational leadership has suggested that it is positively related to emotional intelligence (e.g., Gardner & Stough, 2002) and integrity (Parry & Proctor-Thomson, 2002) – characteristics not typically associated with narcissistic or psychopathic personalities! However, in order to confirm this, further research is required to empirically investigate the relationship between transformational leadership and the 'dark side' of personality.

While much of the literature describes a more clinical or case study approach to the study of dysfunctional leadership personality, the development of the Hogan Development Survey (HDS; Hogan & Hogan, 1997) allows for a dimensional approach to the research. The HDS is a multi-dimensional measure of dysfunctional dispositions, which was specifically developed for use in the workplace. It is comprised of 11 scales, each underpinned by DSM-IV; Axis 2 personality disorders (see Table 1). The 11 scales are subsequently broken down into three components, each of which represents themes from Horney's (1950) model of flawed interpersonal tendencies: (1) "*moving away from people*" (Excitable, Cautious, Skeptical, Reserved and Leisurely), reflecting those who are insecure and move away from people to manage this; (2) "*moving against people*" (Bold, Mischievous, Colorful and Imaginative), reflecting those who are competitive and confident, and move against others through intimidation and manipulation in order to manage their insecurities; and (3) "*moving towards people*" (Diligent and Dutiful), reflecting those who are conformist and obedient, who move towards others to gain approval in order to manage their insecurities (Hogan & Hogan, 1997).

The aim of the current study was to investigate the relationship between managers' scores on the HDS with scores on the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Bass & Avolio, 1995), a measure of transformational leadership. Given the previous findings that transformational leadership is related to integrity and emotional intelligence, suggesting that it is *more* than just charisma, it was hypothesized that transformational leadership scores would be negatively related to Bold (narcissistic) and Mischievous (anti-social) scores on the HDS.

2. Method

2.1. Participants

Questionnaires were administered to 117 chief executives and senior managers from a range of private and public sector organizations in New Zealand. Fully completed questionnaires were returned by 80 participants (35 females and 45 males) – a 68.4% response rate. The mean age was 39.1 years ($SD = 9.64$). The average length of participants' work experience was 17.7 years ($SD = 9.7$).

Table 1

Overlapping themes from HDS and DSM-IV, Axis 2 personality disorders

DSM-IV personality disorders	HDS themes
<i>Borderline</i> Inappropriate anger; unstable and intense relationships alternating between idealization and devaluation.	<i>Excitable</i> Moody and hard to please; intense but short-lived enthusiasm for people, projects, or things.
<i>Paranoid</i> Distrustful and suspicious of others; motives are interpreted as malevolent.	<i>Skeptical</i> Cynical, distrustful, and doubting others' true intentions.
<i>Avoidant</i> Social inhibition, feelings of inadequacy, and hypersensitivity to criticism or rejection.	<i>Cautious</i> Reluctant to take risks for fear of being rejected or negatively evaluated.
<i>Schizoid</i> Emotional coldness and detachment from social relationships; indifferent to praise and criticism.	<i>Reserved</i> Aloof, detached and uncommunicative; lacking interest in or awareness of the feelings of others.
<i>Passive-aggressive</i> ^a Passive resistance to adequate social and occupational performance; irritated when asked to do something he/she does not want to do.	<i>Leisurely</i> Independent; ignoring people's requests and becoming irritated or argumentative if they persist.
<i>Narcissistic</i> Arrogant and haughty behaviours or attitudes; grandiose sense of self-importance and entitlement.	<i>Bold</i> Unusually self-confident; feelings of grandiosity and entitlement; over-valuation of one's capabilities.
<i>Antisocial</i> Disregard for the truth; impulsivity and failure to plan ahead; failure to conform with social norms.	<i>Mischievous</i> Enjoying risk taking and testing the limits; needing excitement; manipulative, deceitful, cunning and exploitive.
<i>Histrionic</i> Excessive emotionality and attention seeking; self-dramatizing, theatrical, and exaggerated emotional expression.	<i>Colorful</i> Expressive, animated and dramatic; wanting to be noticed and needing to be the center of attention.
<i>Schizotypal</i> Odd beliefs or magical thinking; behaviour or speech that is odd, eccentric, or peculiar.	<i>Imaginative</i> Acting and thinking in creative and sometimes odd or unusual ways.
<i>Obsessive-compulsive</i> Preoccupations with orderliness, rules, perfectionism, and control; over-conscientious and inflexible.	<i>Diligent</i> Meticulous, precise and perfectionistic, inflexible about rules and procedures; critical of others' performance.
<i>Dependent</i> Difficulty making everyday decisions without excessive advice and reassurance; difficulty expressing disagreement out of fear of loss of support or approval.	<i>Dutiful</i> Eager to please and reliant on others for support and guidance; reluctant to take independent action or to go against popular opinion.

Note: Hogan and Hogan (1997), Hogan Development Survey (p. 5), By R. Hogan and J. Hogan, 1997, Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessment Systems. Copyright 1997 by R. Hogan and J. Hogan. Reprinted with permission.

^a From DSM.III.R (American Psychiatric Association, 1987).

2.2. Measures

2.2.1. Multifactor leadership questionnaire

(MLQ; Leader Form 5× Short; Bass & Avolio, 1995) is a measure of transformational leadership that is used widely in both leadership development and research. Avolio, Bass, and Jung (1995) have reported evidence for the high reliability, intercorrelations, convergent and discriminant validity of the MLQ-5× dimensions. This study utilized the self-report questionnaire which consists of 45 items assessing the frequency the participant displays the range of the five transformational leadership behaviours (described below) on a 5-point scale ranging from 0 (*not at all*) to 4 (*frequently, if not always*):

- *Idealised influence (behaviour)*, reflecting high standards of ethical/moral conduct and a sense of purpose and mission which are demonstrated in the leader's behaviour and communicated to followers.
- *Idealised influence (attributed)*, which refers to the attributions accorded to the leader from the followers' perception of the leader's behaviour, and basically the emotional part of transformational leadership where followers are steered towards superordinate goals.
- *Inspirational motivation*, which is where the leader provides a strong vision, inspires and instills confidence in followers to attain a goal which they thought unachievable.
- *Intellectual stimulation*, in which the leader rouses the follower to question the norms and think innovatively (beyond the usual) for new solutions and perspectives.
- *Individualised consideration*, where the leader shows support and provides opportunities for the individual growth, needs and development of the follower through consulting and coaching.

2.2.2. Hogan development survey

(HDS; Hogan & Hogan, 1997) was designed as a non-clinical inventory to assess 11 common dysfunctional behaviours in the workplace that could impact negatively on a person's reputation, interpersonal relationships at work, and therefore derail careers. The HDS is employed widely in both the research and applied (consultancy) settings, and consists of 168 items, scored across 11 scales representing the 'dark side' personality dimensions. Respondents are requested to reply 'true' or 'false' to each item. The scales are interpreted in terms of risk, with higher scores indicating an increased potential for work-related problems. The HDS has been shown to be constant over time, with test-retest reliabilities ranging from .58 to .87 (mean = .75), and has been cross validated with the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (Personality Disorder Scales; Morey, Waugh, & Blashfield, 1985) (see Hogan & Hogan, 1997).

2.3. Procedure

Business leaders and managers were identified through the researchers' 'network' in the New Zealand business community, and were asked if they would be prepared to participate in a study investigating the relationship between personality and leadership style. Those who agreed to participate were sent the MLQ and a biographical questionnaire to complete, and were also asked to complete the HDS online. The HDS was administered online as this was the only version available

for research use. For completion of the HDS, participants were directed to a secure and confidential web-site hosted by the HDS distributor in New Zealand (Performance Profiles Ltd). This procedure was approved by the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee.

3. Results

Means and standard deviations for the HDS and MLQ scales are shown in Table 2, along with gender differences between the two measures. It can be seen that males scored higher than females on the Reserved and Mischievous scales of the HDS, females scored higher than males on the Dutiful scale of the HDS and on the Idealized Influence (behaviour) scale of the MLQ.

Table 3 presents correlations between the scales of the HDS and MLQ. It can be seen that bold scores were positively related to idealized influence (attributed) and negatively related to individual consideration, while mischievous scores were positively related to inspirational motivation. In

Table 2

Overall means and standard deviations of HDS and MLQ scores, along with means and standard deviations between genders, tests of between-subjects effects (t) and Cohen's (d) (a measure of effect size)

	Overall sample (<i>N</i> = 80)		Female (<i>N</i> = 35)		Male (<i>N</i> = 45)		<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i> ^a
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
HDS dimensions									
<i>Moving away from people</i>									
Excitable	3.85	3.17	4.57	3.38	3.29	2.90	1.82	.07	.41
Skeptical	5.48	3.03	5.49	3.22	5.47	2.91	0.03	.98	.01
Cautious	4.13	2.75	4.63	2.87	3.73	2.61	1.46	.15	.33
Reserved	4.89	2.48	4.20	2.15	5.42	2.61	−2.24	.03	−.51
Leisurely	6.16	2.43	6.43	2.55	5.96	2.34	0.86	.39	.19
<i>Moving against people</i>									
Bold	8.06	2.76	7.71	2.53	8.33	2.93	−0.99	.32	−.23
Mischievous	6.91	2.39	6.23	2.52	7.44	2.16	−2.32	.02	−.52
Colorful	7.46	2.79	7.06	2.73	7.78	2.83	−1.15	.26	−.26
Imaginative	6.36	2.38	5.77	2.18	6.82	2.45	−1.99	.05	−.45
<i>Moving towards people</i>									
Diligent	9.44	2.23	9.71	2.08	9.22	2.34	0.98	.33	.22
Dutiful	7.49	2.47	8.29	2.32	6.87	2.42	2.65	.01	.60
MLQ dimensions									
Idealized influence (Attributed)	2.85	0.57	2.85	0.50	2.86	0.62	−0.04	.97	−.01
Idealized influence (behaviour)	3.03	0.50	3.16	0.43	2.93	0.54	2.01	.05	.46
Inspirational motivation	3.03	0.50	3.12	0.64	3.11	0.51	0.08	.94	.02
Intellectual stimulation	3.08	0.49	3.11	0.53	3.07	0.46	0.37	.71	.08
Individual consideration	3.29	0.51	3.37	0.53	3.23	0.49	1.27	.21	.28

^a Effect sizes of 0.80 or greater can be considered to be large differences; sizes around 0.50 moderate, and sizes around 0.20 are considered small (Cohen, 1988).

Table 3

Pearson correlation coefficients between the scales of the Hogan Development Survey, the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire scales, and an overall transformational leadership score

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. Excitable	–															
2. Skeptical	.25*	–														
3. Cautious	.46**	.05	–													
4. Reserved	.27*	.32**	.29*	–												
5. Leisurely	.14	.52**	.27*	.27*	–											
6. Bold	.16	.66**	–.03	.19	.50**	–										
7. Mischievous	.03	.51**	–.36**	.05	.30**	.50**	–									
8. Colorful	–.01	.32**	–.24*	–.15	.23*	.51**	.52**	–								
9. Imaginative	.20	.51**	–.02	.22	.31**	.52**	.47**	.55**	–							
10. Diligent	–.06	.28*	.10	.04	.27*	.35**	.10	.11	.08	–						
11. Dutiful	.17	–.03	.39**	–.23*	.17	.02	–.15	.19	–.07	.20	–					
12. Idealized influence (Attributed)	.05	.16	–.12	.05	.21	.27*	.17	.25*	.20	–.03	.08	–				
13. Idealized influence (Behaviour)	–.18	–.10	–.33**	–.29**	–.09	–.12	.06	.13	–.03	.04	.11	.29*	–			
14. Inspirational motivation	–.24*	–.04	–.36**	–.26*	–.09	–.04	.23*	.32**	.15	.00	.05	.23*	.44**	–		
15. Intellectual stimulation	–.13	–.13	–.30**	–.17	–.13	–.09	.03	.11	–.04	–.03	.05	.12	.45**	.31**	–	
16. Individual consideration	–.13	–.31**	–.10	–.33**	–.13	–.34**	–.15	.08	–.22*	–.22*	.22	.22	.32**	.30**	.44**	–
17. Transformational leadership	–.20	–.15	–.37**	–.32**	–.09	–.12	.09	.25*	.00	–.07	.15	.48**	.77**	.68**	.72**	.68**

* $p < 0.05$.** $p < 0.01$.

order to investigate these relationships further, transformational leadership scale scores were entered into a principal components analysis. As Judge and Bono (2000) and Bass and Riggio (2006) noted, the transformational leadership components are often combined to create a total score on transformational leadership, which is acceptable given the intercorrelations among the MLQ transformational leadership scales. In this study, a principal component analysis of the five transformational leadership scale scores (Idealized Influence [attributed], Idealized Influence [behaviour], Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Individualized Consideration) was thus conducted, with only one component extracted with an Eigenvalue above 1 (2.27), which accounted for 45.41% of the variance. This appears to suggest that a single dimension could capture the variance in the transformational leadership dimensions (see Judge & Bono, 2000). The factor scores were thus treated as a single dimension and saved as an overall ‘transformational leadership’ variable for subsequent regression analyses using the standard regression method (the saved factor score demonstrated sufficient convergence with the summed scale score [$r = 0.99$]). Three standard (entry) regression analyses were computed on the data in order to examine the relationship between the overall ‘transformational leadership’ variable and the HDS dimensions. Hogan and Hogan (2001) principal components analysis of the HDS scales, which extracted three components that corresponded with Horney (1950) taxonomy of flawed interpersonal characteristics, served as the independent variables in three separate regression analyses. The three components were categorized into the three themes of ‘moving away from people’

Table 4

Standard multiple regression of the ‘moving against people’, ‘moving away from people’, and ‘moving towards people’ scales on the saved ‘transformational leadership’ factor scores

	Standard regression coefficient	
	β	t
<i>Moving away from people</i>		
Intercept = .83		
Excitable	.038	0.31
Cautious	–.353	–2.80***
Skeptical	–.139	–1.06
Reserved	–.218	–1.89
Leisurely	.131	1.02
<i>Moving against people</i>		
Intercept = –.15		
Bold	–.323	–2.39*
Mischievous	.073	0.55
Colorful	.439	3.15**
Imaginative	–.111	–0.81
<i>Moving towards people</i>		
Intercept = –.09		
Diligent	–.10	–0.90
Dutiful	.17	1.50

* $p < 0.05$.

** $p < 0.005$.

*** $p < 0.01$.

(Excitable, Cautious, Skeptical, Reserved, and Leisurely); ‘moving against people’ (Bold, Mischievous, Colorful and Imaginative); and ‘moving towards people’ (Diligent and Dutiful). A significant model was obtained, $R^2 = .20$ ($F = 3.71$; $p = 0.01$) with the ‘moving away from people’ scales included as the independent variables, with cautious being negatively retained as a predictor (see Table 4). A significant model was obtained, $R^2 = .16$ ($F = 3.47$; $p = 0.01$) with the ‘moving against people’ scales included as the independent variables, with Colorful being positively retained as a predictor and Bold being negatively retained as a predictor (see Table 4). Finally, the regression computed on the ‘moving towards others’ scales failed to obtain a significant model, $R^2 = 0.03$ ($F = 1.32$; $p = 0.28$) (see Table 4).

4. Discussion

The aim of the current study was to examine the relationship between transformational leadership and the ‘dark side’ of leadership personality. It can be seen from the initial correlations that transformational leadership total scores were negatively related with Cautious and Reserved HDS scores, and positively related with Colorful scores. In relation to the hypothesized relationships, that both Bold and Mischievous scores would be negatively related to transformational leadership, these failed to be substantiated. However, it is interesting to note a number of the correlations with the MLQ subscales, which may have cancelled out an overall relationship with the total transformational leadership score, for example, the positive correlation between Bold and Idealized Influence (attributed) and the negative relationship between Bold and Individual Consideration. The relationship between Bold scores and Idealized Influence (attributed) transformational leadership behaviour may suggest a relation to various managerial derailment patterns, such as the inability to build relationships with co-workers, adapt to new cultures, and failing to meet business objectives (e.g., Van Velsor & Leslie, 1995). However, at this juncture it should be noted that the areas where narcissistic individuals have overrated views of themselves include their self-evaluation of their task performance (Robins & Paulhus, 2001). Additionally, Judge, LePine, and Rich (2006) found that while narcissism was positively related to self perceptions and self-reports of leadership practices, it was negatively related to others’ reports of leadership capability. Therefore, a narcissistic individual, as measured by the Bold dimension on the HDS, may possibly accord a higher rating to his or her personal leadership behaviour for the relevant items on the MLQ. Additionally, this result could be due to the characteristics of the narcissistic personality disorder itself: denial of the presence of any significant faults, fallibilities or shortcomings is characteristic of the narcissistic personality (Watson & Clark, 1984)!

The positive relationship between the Mischievous dimension and the Inspirational Motivation behaviour suggests it is necessary for an individual to possess confidence and risk-taking characteristics in order to exhibit the Inspirational Motivation behaviour. The strong connection of the Inspirational Motivation behaviour to charisma brings up the issue of dramatizing, where charismatic leaders utilize their oratorical skills to convince and influence others to achieve the goal (Gardner & Avolio, 1998). This again is related to the theory of authentic and pseudo-transformational leadership, where followers may be attracted to the ‘heroism’ in the leader, and be manipulated unknowingly. It is noteworthy that Barling et al. (2000) reported the highest correlations between emotional intelligence and the Inspirational Motivation behaviour, while Palmer,

Walls, Burgess, and Stough (2001) found that the ability to monitor and manage emotions in one-self and others is significantly correlated with the Idealized Influence and Inspirational Motivation behaviours. This may be viewed from another perspective, however; while ethical and authentic leaders may utilize emotional intelligence and oratorical skills for moral goals, there is also the possibility that inauthentic or pseudo-transformational leaders might utilize the same skills for corrupt goals and self-benefits.

In order to further investigate the current findings, three regressions were computed to examine the relationship between transformational leadership and the HDS dimensions against Horney's (1950) model of flawed interpersonal tendencies. The first regression with the 'moving against people' theme found the Colorful dimension from this classification to be the strongest positive predictor of transformational leadership, while Bold was retained as a negative predictor. The retention of Bold in the model lends some support to our underlying hypothesis that Bold would be negatively related to transformational leadership, and is consistent with those studies that suggest transformational leadership to be *more* than just 'charisma'. In relation to the result with Colorful scores, this is a new finding in a literature which has typically focused on narcissism in transformational leadership. However, this result is consistent with Board and Fritzon (2005) finding that chief executives and senior managers of leading UK companies scored higher on the Histrionic scale of the MMPI (Personality Disorder Scales) than did clinical samples from Broadmoor Special Hospital in the UK. The characteristics of the Colorful dimension include a desire to be the centre of attention, skill at making dramatic entrances and departures, flirtatiousness, charm, the ability to form relationships quickly (Hogan & Hogan, 1997). Despite their ability to draw attention to themselves (which is probably the element of their behaviour that links with transformational leadership), these individuals are associated with weak interpersonal relationships and team-building skills as their focus is on themselves, which is in line with the managerial derailment literature (e.g., Van Velsor & Leslie, 1995).

The second standard regression with the 'moving away from people' factors included as the independent variables revealed the Cautious dimension as the strongest significant negative predictor of transformational leadership. This suggests that a 'cautious' personality, characterized by a reluctance to take risks for fear of being negatively appraised, will be less likely to demonstrate transformational leadership behaviour. The Cautious dimension of the HDS is based on the avoidant DSM-IV personality disorder. It is useful to note that one of the criteria for avoidant personality disorder is the avoidance of activities involving considerable interpersonal contact for fear of rejection and criticism (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). This behaviour contrasts the characteristics associated with emotional intelligence which emphasises interpersonal skills. As seen in the study by Barbuto and Burbach (2006), empathy, interpersonal skills and overall emotional intelligence possess positive relationships with the transformational leadership behaviours, consistent with previous studies (e.g., Barling et al., 2000; Gardner & Stough, 2002), therefore supporting the regression results of the cautious dimension as a negative predictor of transformational leadership.

While this research presents some interesting results, there are a number of limitations to the study that need to be considered. Firstly, this was an exploratory study with a small sample size. It is therefore necessary for further studies to be carried out to confirm the current results and allow for future meta-analyses. Secondly, findings of this study may be susceptible to common method variance as it is based on self-reported data. There is sufficient support for the proposition

that in work settings people's self-impressions are magnified by a common tendency to self-enhance, and they tend to view themselves more positively than appraisals of them from other sources (e.g., Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). Thus, future research should conduct a multi-source measurement of transformational leadership, including ratings from subordinates and superiors, as well as self-ratings. Despite these limitations, the current results do however provide some interesting and original findings, and make a useful contribution to the ongoing research into the 'dark side' of leadership personality.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Dave Winsborough (Winsborough Ltd., New Zealand) and Karen Morris (Performance Profiles Ltd., New Zealand) for providing access to the Hogan Development Survey and their help and support in the use of this measure. Additionally, thanks are extended to the Postgraduate Scholarships Committee of the University of Auckland Business School for financial assistance given to this project. Finally, the authors would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for their constructive and helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

References

- American Psychiatric Association (1987). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- American Psychiatric Association (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed – TR.). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1995). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire technical report*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- Babiak, P., & Hare, R. D. (2006). *Snakes in suits: When psychopaths go to work*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Barbuto, J. E., Jr., & Burbach, M. E. (2006). The emotional intelligence of transformational leaders: A field study of elected officials. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 146, 51–64.
- Barling, J., Slater, F., & Kelloway, E. K. (2000). Transformational leadership and emotional intelligence: An exploratory study. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 21, 157–161.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire for research*. Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden, Inc.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire – Manual & sampler set* (3rd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden, Inc.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggo, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 181–217.
- Beyer, J. M. (1999). Taming and promoting charisma to change organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 307–330.
- Board, B. J., & Fritzson, K. (2005). Disordered personalities at work. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 11, 17–32.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 901–910.
- Burch, G. St. J. (2006). The creative-schizotype: Help or hindrance to team-level innovation? *University of Auckland Business Review*, 8(1), 43–51.

- Burch, G. St. J., & Anderson, N. (2008). Personality at work. In P. J. Corr & G. Matthews (Eds.), *Handbook of personality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Conger, J. A. (1990). The dark side of leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 19, 44–55.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Leadership in organizations*. London: Sage.
- Furnham, A., & Taylor, J. (2004). *The dark side of behaviour at work: Understanding and avoiding employees leaving, thieving and deceiving*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Gardner, W. L., & Avolio, B. J. (1998). The charismatic relationship: A dramaturgical perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 32–58.
- Gardner, L., & Stough, C. (2002). Examining the relationship between leadership and emotional intelligence in senior level managers. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23, 68–78.
- Goldman, A. (2006). Personality disorders in leaders: Implications of the DSM IV-TR in assessing dysfunctional organizations. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21, 392–414.
- Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (1997). *Hogan development survey*. Tulsa, Oklahoma: Hogan Assessment Systems.
- Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2001). Assessing leadership: A view from the dark side. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9, 40–51.
- Horney, K. (1950). *Neurosis and human growth*. New York: Norton.
- Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 751–765.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 765–780.
- Judge, T. A., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2006). Loving yourself abundantly: Relationship of the narcissistic personality to self- and other perceptions of workplace deviance, leadership, and task and contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 762–776.
- Lubit, R. (2002). The long-term organizational impact of destructively narcissistic managers. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16, 127–138.
- Montgomery, B. (1961). *The path to leadership*. London: Collins.
- Morey, L. C., Waugh, M. H., & Blashfield, R. K. (1985). MMPI scales for the DSM-III personality disorders: Their derivation and correlates. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 245–251.
- Moscoso, S., & Salgado, J. F. (2004). “Dark side” personality styles as predictors of task, contextual, and job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 12, 356–362.
- Palmer, B., Walls, M., Burgess, Z., & Stough, Co. (2001). Emotional intelligence and effective leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22, 1–7.
- Parry, K. W., & Proctor-Thomson, S. B. (2002). Perceived integrity of transformational leaders in organizational settings. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 35, 75–96.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management*, 12, 531–544.
- Price, T. L. (2003). The ethics of authentic transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 67–81.
- Robins, R. W., & Paulhus, D. L. (2001). The character of self-enhancers: Implications for organizations. In B. W. Roberts & R. Hogan (Eds.), *Personality psychology in the workplace*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Rosenthal, S. A., & Pittinsky, T. L. (2006). Narcissistic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 617–633.
- Sankowsky, D. (1995). The charismatic leader as narcissist: Understanding the abuse of power. *Organizational Dynamics*, 23, 57–71.
- Van Velsor, E., & Leslie, J. B. (1995). Why executives derail: Perspectives across time and cultures. *Academy of Management Executive*, 9, 62–72.
- Watson, D., & Clark, L. (1984). Negative affectivity: The disposition to experience aversive emotional states. *Psychological Bulletin*, 96, 465–490.